

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated May 31, 2006, the Office indicated that claim 25 was allowed and claims 1-24 and 26-28 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and further in view of 35 U.S.C. §102 in light of the teachings found in the reference to Sugimoto et al. The Office indicated that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as outlined in the Office Action and that claims 2-11, 13, 16-18 and 20-24 and 26-28 would be allowable if further rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as set forth in the Office Action and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Based upon the helpful suggestions provided by the Office, the present claims have been amended consistent with the holding of allowable subject matter. In this regard, the Office will note that the substance of claim 2 has been incorporated into amended claim 1. For the reasons set forth in the Office Action, the Applicant believes that claim 1 as presently amended is allowable over the art of record. Claim 2 is cancelled by means of the present amendment. Further, claims 3-11 have been amended to remove the objections as outlined pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Office will note that claim 12 has been amended in a fashion to incorporate the substance of previous claim 13. For the reasons set forth in the recent Office Action, claim 12 is now believed to be allowable. Claim 13 is hereby cancelled without prejudice to the claims remaining in this case as a result of this amendment. Claims 14-24 have been amended to address the issues raised pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and are believed to be similarly allowable.



Claim 25 was deemed allowable in the Office's first action. Claims 26-28 have been amended to address the issues raised pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Office objected to certain features of the specification as outlined in the recent Office Action. Those objectionable features have been addressed by the amendments which have been made to the specification, as provided herewith.

In view of the amendments made to the present application, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, prompt Notice of Allowance of claims 1, 3-12, 14-28 are respectfully requested in the Office's next action.

Applicants', by and through their counsel, would request that the Office telephone the attorneys in the event that a further telephone conference could expedite the prompt handling of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

DOUGLAS HAUFF et al.

Dated: 16 Aug 2006

By: 

George G. Grigel  
Reg. No. 31,166